



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,627	06/24/2003	Fernando Cuervo	ALC3449	1150
76614	7590	11/24/2008		
Kramer & Amado, P.C. 1725 Duke Street Suite 240 Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
			ART UNIT 2445	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,627

Applicant(s)

CUERVO, FERNANDO

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/29/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argued that Poliquin and Rakoshitz failed to disclose in combination a pre-computation module which not only evaluates policies on a priority basis as necessitated by demand and resources, but also continuously evaluates policies based on passive conditions associated with policy equivalency classes, the passive conditions being distinguished from triggering conditions associated with the policy equivalency classes and which are used as the basis for issuing policy decisions established according to the dual evaluation/reevaluation scheme. Specifically, the pre-computation module is stated to classify conditions of each policy type into one triggering and one or more passive conditions; schedule prioritized policy evaluations based on demands and available resources; continuously evaluate policies based on changes related to all passive conditions; and issue a policy decision associated with a particular triggering condition based detection of the triggering condition.
3. Poliquin teaches an alarm system which works based on filter parameters (triggering conditions). Poliquin, column 7, lines 24-59. Poliquin stores a relationship between policies (triggering conditions) and applications in a database (classifying conditions). Poliquin, column 8, lines 42-49. Rakoshitz taught the prioritization was utilizable for a specific user, application, or database in regard to priority and limits such as bandwidth, resource utilization, and admission (schedule prioritized policy evaluations based on demands and available resources; classify according to one or more passive conditions, where the passive conditions are bandwidth and resource utilization). Rakoshitz, column 6, lines 16-30. The monitoring in Rakoshitz is ongoing, and the monitoring in Rakoshitz is of the "passive conditions" of resource utilization and bandwidth. The combination of Poliquin and Rakoshitz performs the identical function specified in the claim in substantially the same way, and produces substantially the same results as the corresponding elements disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2445

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poliquin et al. (US 5,696,486) in view of Rakoshitz et al. (US 6,816,903).

6. In regard to claims 1 and 8, Poliquin disclosed a network management and alarm system which scheduled policy evaluation based on alarm events, and logged the information.

7. Poliquin disclosed:

a pre-computation module classifying conditions of policy types into one triggering condition (alarms in Poliquin) and at least one passive condition (use of passive conditions brought in by Rakoshitz) and grouping a plurality of policies having the same triggering condition and policy decision into a policy equivalency class, said pre-computation module continuously evaluating said policies based on changes in said passive conditions, and said pre-computation module further scheduling a prioritized evaluation based on demand and/or resources (brought in by Rakoshitz); Column 10, lines 21-34

a scheduler initiating said prioritized policy evaluation based on received events satisfying passive conditions determining policy-managed entity memberships with respect to the policy equivalency class; column 9, line 60 – column 10, line 20

a triggering module monitoring communication network events satisfying the triggering condition; and column 7, line 19 – column 8, line 29

a policy decision distribution mechanism issuing the policy decision upon detection of the triggering condition being satisfied, and distributing the policy decision to the policy equivalency class member policy-managed entities of said policy equivalency class for policy enforcement, column 8, line 30 – column 9, line 13;

a policy repository for storing the plurality of policies and the policy decision. Column 11, lines 50-67. Column 9, lines 45-59

Art Unit: 2445

Poliquin failed to disclose prioritization of the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on demand for the class and available resources. However, Rakoshitz disclosed using available bandwidth and priorities for users based on demand and available resources to determine a priority scheme. Rakoshitz, column 6, lines 16-30, column 10, lines 23-36, column 10, line 48 - column 11, line 45; column 14, lines 30-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a determination of available resources and demand in order to provide system efficiency and reduce network congestion. (Rakoshitz, column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 12).

8. In regard to claim 2, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy server being associated with a network management system providing support of one of policy-based network management, and policy-based service provisioning. Column 5, lines 33-39

9. In regard to claim 4, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy repository comprises one of a database and a directory. Column 5, line 45

10. In regard to claim 5, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy repository further comprises a policy condition management interface providing interaction with one of the policies and policy conditions. column 6, lines 45-65

11. In regard to claim 6, Poliquin disclosed:

the policy server being further associated with a policy equivalency class repository for storing policy equivalency class specifications. Column 8, lines 42-49

12. In regard to claim 7, Poliquin disclosed:

a policy condition management interface providing interaction with one of the policies and policy conditions. Column 9, lines 14-67

13. In regard to claims 9, 12, Poliquin disclosed:

wherein performing policy evaluation based on satisfying the triggering condition, the method further comprises a step of: changing a corresponding policy-managed entity's membership with respect to the policy equivalency class. Column 9, lines 14-67

14. In regard to claim 10, Poliquin disclosed:

monitoring events in a communications network. Column 6, lines 4-65

15. In regard to claim 13, Poliquin disclosed:

prioritizing passive condition related policy evaluation based on a demand for one of a policy and the policy equivalency class. Column 7, lines 34-67

16. In regard to claim 14, Poliquin disclosed:

determining a demand for the one of the policy and the policy equivalency class based on a previous utilization frequency thereof. Column 8, lines 1-41

17. In regard to claim 15, Poliquin disclosed:

specifying a policy condition. Column 10, lines 21-60

18. In regard to claim 16, Poliquin disclosed:

designating the policy condition as one of the triggering condition and a passive condition. Column 10, lines 21-60

19. In regard to claim 17, Poliquin disclosed:

wherein specifying the triggering condition, the method further comprises a step of: specifying one of a time-of-day event, a quality-of-service event, a source available event, a source unavailable event, a broadcast start event, and an information flow available event to be monitored. Column 10, lines 21-67

20. In regard to claim 18, Poliquin disclosed:

logically combining events. Column 15, lines 40-67

21. In regard to claim 19, Poliquin disclosed:

specifying one of a prepaid status event, a policy-managed entity on-line event, a policy-managed entity off-line event, a policy-managed entity capability, and a policy-managed entity interest in a service. Column 10, lines 21-67

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
23. Thebaut et al. US 5,889,953
24. Vaid et al. US 6,502,131
25. Black et al. US 7,143,153
26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Donaghue can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2445

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Examiner
Art Unit 2445

/J. R. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/Larry D Donaghue/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454